

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,986	03/31/2004	Yun-Ho Jung	8733.657.10-US	5992
75	590 02/23/2005		EXAM	INER
Song K. Jung MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006			SMOOT, STEPHEN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2813	
			DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
			JUNG, YUN-HO			
Office Action Summary		10/812,986 Examiner	Art Unit			
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		2813			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Stephen W. Smoot				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - External after - If the - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1' SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to , cause the application to become ABANDONEC	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 M	larch 2004.				
-	<u> </u>	action is non-final.				
,—						
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 7-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		·			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/157,201. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 3-31-04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/812,986

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to application papers filed on 31 March 2004, which includes a preliminary amendment that has been entered.

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Sequential Lateral Solidification Mask with Stripe-Shaped Portions for Transmitting Laser Light.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Update the Cross-Reference section (see Preliminary Amendment filed on 31 March 2004, page 2) to indicate that 10/157,201 has issued as US 6,736,895; and

The first paragraph of the originally filed specification should be deleted because this information has been incorporated into the Cross-Reference section as amended on 31 March 2004.

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,986 Page 3

Art Unit: 2813

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2).

Referring to Figs. 1, 2 and column 3, line 66 to column 5, line 20, Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) disclose a mask (18) with rectangular slits (29, 31) for projecting an image from a laser source (12) onto a substrate (16). These are all of the limitations set forth in claim 7 of the applicant's invention.

5. Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Voutsas et al. (US 6,792,029 B2).

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Referring to Fig.10, column 1, lines 8-22, column 3, lines 27-30, and column 4, lines 30-39, Voutsas et al. (US 6,792,029 B2) disclose modifying the slits (52) of a mask (50), used to shape a laser beam for crystallizing amorphous material, by patterning the mask to have triangular end regions. These are all of the limitations set forth in claims 7, 8 of the applicant's invention.

6. Claims 7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crowder (US 6,767,804 B2).

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Referring to Fig.12, column 2, lines 37-58, and column 4, lines 25-37, Crowder discloses a sequential lateral solidification mask with slits for shaping a transmitted laser beam into beamlets that have a width (W) that is wider than the gap (g) between adjacent beamlets. These are all of the limitations set forth in claims 7, 10 of the applicant's invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/812,986

Art Unit: 2813

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Uchida (JP 62-026884 A – from applicant's IDS).

As shown above, Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) anticipate claim 7 of the applicant's invention. However, Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) lack the further limitation to claim 7 set forth in claim 9 of the applicant's invention, which is a mask with stripe shaped light-transmitting portions that have semicircular shaped edges. Uchida teaches a strip-shaped mask with ends that are configured to be semicircular in shape (see abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) and Uchida in order to round the edges of the slits taught by Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) into a semicircular shape as taught by Uchida. Uchida recognizes that the semicircular shape of the edges improves the optical cracking level of crystals that are exposed with a laser beam.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) as applied to claim 7 above.

As shown above, Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) anticipate claim 7 of the applicant's invention. However, Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) lack the further

Art Unit: 2813

limitation to claim 7 set forth in claim 11 of the applicant's invention, which is a light transmitting stripe width that is less than or equal to twice the maximum length of lateral grain growth.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mask of Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2) by adjusting the width of the slit to meet the limitation of claim 11 through routine experimentation, unless the applicant can show that this limitation achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art of Voutsas et al. (US 6,573,163 B2). See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955), in which it was held "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation".

Conclusion

- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jung and Kang et al. teach masks with slit-shaped openings for the sequential lateral solidification of amorphous silicon.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen W. Smoot whose telephone number is 571-272-1698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 am to 4:30 pm).

Application/Control Number: 10/812,986 Page 7

Art Unit: 2813

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SWS

Rephen W. AMOO Patent Examiner Ant Unit 2813